

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
GREENVILLE DIVISION

Clayton Thomas Jones,	)	
	)	Civil Action No. 6:13-2169-TMC
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	<b>ORDER</b>
	)	
Greenville County Police Department;	)	
Greenville County Solicitor Lucas Marchant;	)	
Greenville County Detention Center; Greenville	)	
County Magistrate Court; Greenville County	)	
Circuit Court; D.A. Kern, Officer; Lashawn	)	
Nuhu Reid, Judge, Municipal Court; D.P.	)	
Garrison, Officer; John Barksdale, Judge; Mark	)	
W. Hartle, Judge; Timothy Sullivan, Public	)	
Defender; James M. Dorriety, Assistant	)	
Administrator, GCDC; Letitia H. Verdin, Judge;	)	
Scott D. Robinson, Attorney,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

The plaintiff, Clayton Thomas Jones (“Jones”), filed this action *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging that the defendants violated his constitutional rights.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d), D.S.C., all pre-trial matters have been referred to a magistrate judge. This case is now before the court on the magistrate judge’s report and recommendation (“Report”), recommending that the court dismiss this action without prejudice and without service of process. (ECF No. 11.) The magistrate judge’s recommendation has no presumptive weight and this court retains the responsibility to make a final determination. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976).

The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report to which a party specifically objects, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in

part, the magistrate judge's recommendation or recommit the matter with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). However, the court has no duty to conduct a de novo review if a party's objections are "general and conclusory" and "do not direct the court to a specific error in the magistrate's proposed findings and recommendations." *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982).

In this case, Jones filed timely objections to the Report. (ECF No. 13.) However, his objections merely restate factual allegations and legal conclusions from his complaint and fail to address any specific, dispositive portion of the Report.<sup>1</sup> The court has thoroughly reviewed the Report and Jones's objections and finds no reason to deviate from the Report's recommended disposition. Accordingly, the court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. This case is, therefore, dismissed without prejudice and without service of process.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Timothy M. Cain  
United States District Court Judge

September 17, 2013  
Anderson, South Carolina

#### **NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this order pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.

---

<sup>1</sup> In addition, to the extent Jones has moved this court to dismiss his state court indictment, (ECF No. 13-1) that motion is not properly before this court.